

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
DONATUS: LIFE. WORKS	I
COMMENTARY ON TERENCE:	
History, authorities, editions, special work, condition of Gk. words, etc.	I
ARCHAISM OF TERENCE MENTIONED BY DON.:	
Authorities, Don. idea of an archaism, its definition, periphrases for ἀρχαϊσμός, limit in time of his archaisms, range of authors quoted, number of usages noted, etc.	2
PLAN OF ARRANGEMENT.	4
I. OF THE SENTENCE IN GENERAL.	
1. Figures:	
παρέλκον	5
παρόμοιον, παρονομασία	9
Ellipsis, etc.	11
Figura etymologica	13
ὁμοιοτέλετον	13
Irony	13
2. Position: enim, nam, etc.	14
3. Construction according to sense	14
4. Attraction	15
5. Old formulæ	15
II. OF SINGLE WORDS, ETC.	
1. Words obsolete or rare as noted by Donatus:	
Nouns	16
Pronouns	16
Verbs	17
Adverbs	17
2. Words, the meaning of which has changed, etc.:	
Nouns	18
Adjectives	20
Verbs	20
Adverbs	22

3. Changes in form, inflections, etc. :	
Nouns	23
Pronouns	24
Verbs	25
Adverbs	26
4. Peculiarities in gender	26
5. Syntax :	
Nouns	27
Verbs	28
Adverbs	30
III. GENERAL REMARKS :	
Derivation	30
Orthography	31
Conclusion	31
LIFE	33

ARCHAISMS OF TERENCE MENTIONED IN THE COMMENTARY OF DONATUS.

INTRODUCTION.

In the chronicle of Eusebius, at the year 354 A. D., A. U. C. 1108, St. Jerome says: "Victorinus rhetor et Donatus grammaticus, praeceptor meus, Romae insignes habentur." In his comment on Eccles. ch. 1, St. Jerome again calls him "praeceptor meus," and in his *Apol. adv. Rufinum* 1. 16 he addresses him a third time by that title, also mentioning his commentaries on Terence and Vergil.

At the close of the commentary to each play of Terence, Donatus is designated as "Orator Urbis Romae." It is not settled whether, as is probably the case, he held some official position entitling him to that name, or he preferred to be called "orator," i. e. "rhetor," rather than the humbler "grammaticus." This is all that is known of the life of Aelius Donatus, the grammarian. (See Schopen, "De Terentio et Donato eius Interprete," Bonn, 1821, p. 32 ff.; Ribbeck, *Proleg. Verg.* p. 178 ff.; Teuffel, *Röm. Litt.*, pp. 959 and 960.)

WORKS.

1. A Commentary on the poems of Vergil; certainly the *Georgics* and *Aeneid*—probably the *Eclogues*. Servius refers to it oftener than to any other commentary on Vergil (twice in the *Eclogues*, nine times in the *Georgics*, and thirty-five times in the *Aeneid*), but otherwise none of it has been preserved.

2. An "Ars Grammatica," consisting of two parts (Keil, *Gram. Lat.* IV, 355-402).

3. A Commentary on the plays of Terence, which, barring the "Hauton Timorumenos," we now possess. In its present condition this commentary is evidently a compilation from several others. One of them was doubtless the work of Euanthius, while, according to Usener (*Rhein. Mus.* 23. 493), notes of a philosophical or rhetorical character may be attributed to Donatus. Successive generations of scholars have contributed their share, extracts from other commentators have been added, new and con-

flicting explanations have been offered by men of greater or less intelligence, and, finally, to complicate matters still further, a new race of commentators sprung up, interpreters of the notes themselves, which by this time had become obscure. (Cf. Don. ad And. prol. 18; 1. 1. 28, etc.; Umpfenbach, *Hermes* 2. 337 ff.)

The fact that the work has, at different times, been compressed to fit the margin or the interlinear spaces of the MSS. of Terence makes it impossible that we can ever know the exact words of Donatus himself. We shall do well if we discover what his views were in every instance.

Of the older editions the best are the Venice (1485) and Westerhovius (1726). The latest and, at present, the best is by Reinhold Klotz (Leipsic, 1838-40).

Much was done to restore the original reading of the various scholia and to replace and sift passages either omitted or carelessly treated by previous editors. At the same time there is need of a new and critical edition, embodying the results of the material which has been accumulating for the past seventy years, beginning with some important contributions by Schopen. (See also Umpfenbach, *Hermes* 2. 337-402; Dziatzko, *Rhein. Mus.* 29. 445 ff. and 511; *Jahrb.* 10, Suppl. bd.; Studemund, *Jahrb.* 97. 546 ff.)

The Greek words and quotations in Donatus are in a deplorable state. Sometimes a space was left by the scribe to be filled in by some one more conversant with the language than himself, and it was never done; often the words are confused or mutilated beyond recognition, or else omitted altogether, with a consequent confusion in the note. Klotz has done something to restore the text, but, of course, the task can hardly be other than a hopeless one.

So much for a brief resumé. Let us now turn our attention to the subject we had determined to consider, namely: The Archaisms in Terence mentioned in the Commentary of Donatus.

It is proposed to enquire what Donatus calls an archaism; the value of his observations under this head, examined by the light of other observations, ancient and modern, in the same field, and whether any confusion in the text can thereby be detected.

The commentator's idea of an archaism may be derived from a comparison of the various passages where he uses "*ἀρχαϊσμός*," "*veteres dicebant*," and the like. In explaining the form "*ornati*" (*Eun.* 2. 2. 6), Donatus says: "*Et ornati ut senati: antiquus*

genetivus." Especially important is the Schol. Bemb. 2d hand to the same passage: ". . . nos dicimus, 'huius ornatus.' Ceterum archaismos est, id est, *antiquitas exigit* 'huius ornati.' Sic alibi, 'nihil ornati, nihil tumulti.' Et Salustius, 'igitur senati decreto.'"

The quotation "nihil ornati, nihil tumulti," is from Andria 2. 2. 28, where Donatus has the note: ". . . Ἀρχαϊσμός. Sic Salustius, 'ergo senati decreto,' etc." Compare Hec. 3. 2. 21: "Antiqui sic declinaverunt 'tumulti,' 'senati,' ut Salustius," etc., and Phorm. 1. 3. 2, where And. 2. 2. 28 is again referred to.

Whenever, then, Donatus speaks of an archaism he calls attention to something obsolete or old-fashioned in his own time. That such a "novarum rerum studiosus" as Terence should have made a conscious use of such expressions is, of course, out of the question. A number of equivalents or periphrases for the technical "ἀρχαϊσμός" are used. It can easily be shown, however, that Donatus has no thought of making any distinction. For instance: Eun. 3. 5. 39; 4. 3. 2; Adel. 5. 4. 5 the "figura etymologica" is called "ἀρχαϊσμός"; in Phorm. prol. 19 "vetuste." In Adel. 5. 3. 55 both "ἀρχαϊσμός" and "veteres dicebant" are used (cp. Phorm. 1. 2. 80; Eun. 2. 3. 82; 4. 4. 11).

The expression oftenest used is "veteres dicebant or dixerunt," the latter often of some opinion held by the ancients themselves. Twice "dixere" (And. 1. 1. 28; 4. 4. 36). "Ἀρχαϊσμός" itself occurs something like a score of times, occasionally, like the others, accompanied by some qualifying expression. "Ἀρχαῖως" occurs once (Hec. 1. 2. 110) and "olim" once (Hec. 1. 2. 7); "apud veteres" ten times. So "vetuste," "antique," "vetusta declinatio or ἑλλειψις," "veteres ponebant, scribebant, declinabant, addebant, proferebant, referebant, iungebant, figurabant, loquebantur, legerunt," "usitatum veteribus," "usitatum est veteribus sic dicere," "vetus or antiqua locutio," "sic veteres loquebantur, nos vero dicimus," "ut veteres solent loqui," "sic veteres," "sic veteres dicere maluerunt," "secundum veteres or antiquos," "antiqui dicebant," "in veteribus invenitur," "hoc vetus est," "antique dicitur, dixit or locutus est," "sic frequenter veteres," "antiquorum more dixit," "sic veteres—nos, or quod nos," "nos dicimus," "quod or quae nos," "quod nos tantum," and "veteribus non placet."

As far as one may judge from an investigation of his notes on that subject, most of the usages which Donatus terms archaisms

became such, roughly speaking, about the beginning of the Empire. In fact, before that time many of them had passed over to the poets or to such conscious archaists as Sallust. That certain of them are to be found in authors like Fronto or Gellius goes rather to prove that they were then felt as archaisms than that they were a part of the living language. Gellius and his compeers, like a certain class of writers to-day, were very fond of tricking out style with the borrowed finery of the olden time.

Of the authors quoted by Donatus for illustrations of archaic usage none, it will be noticed, are later than the time of Augustus. Most frequently quoted, of course, is Vergil (Aeneid 10. 641, 719; 1. 595; 3. 183; 12. 680; 4. 93; 2. 25; 6. 765; 2. 148, 719; 3. 685; 4. 597. Eclogues 1. 30; 3. 1; 6. 47; 3. 102 (see, however, Hagen, Jahrb. 14. 472)—the Georgics are not quoted.)

In addition, the list embraces Naevius (Bell. Pun.), Ennius (Annales and Medea), Plautus (Aul., Epid., Trin.), Caccilius, Pacuvius, Accius, Lucilius, Cato, Pomponius, Varro, Tubero, Lucretius, Cicero, Sallust, and once, Horace. It does not follow, of course, that Donatus had read the authors he uses, for, as is well known, most of the quotations in the Latin grammarians were cited over and over again. Altogether, there are about one hundred and forty notices in Donatus of older usage, embracing a variety of subjects. Although the division cannot be rigidly exclusive, for convenience they may be classed under the following general heads:

I. Of the sentence in general.

1. Figures.

- (a.) *παρέλκον*.
- (b.) *παρόμοιον—παρονομασία*.
- (c.) *ἔλλειψις*, etc.
- (d.) "Figura etymologica."
- (e.) *ὁμοιοτέλετον*.
- (f.) Irony.

2. Position.

3. Construction acc. to sense.

4. Attraction.

5. Old formulae.

II. Nouns, adjectives, pronouns, etc.

- 1. Words obsolete.
- 2. Words changed in meaning.
- 3. Peculiarities in form, gender, etc.
- 4. Syntax.

III. General.

Derivation, orthography, etc.

Following the order proposed, let us begin with the figures which Donatus looks upon as archaisms. (On the general subject of figures in Donatus, Hahn has written two important articles: "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Scholien des Donat zum Terenz," Progr. Halberstadt, 1870 and '72. Special treatises will be mentioned in their proper places.)

(a.) *παρέλκον*.

(Hahn, Progr. 1872, p. 4 ff.)

Under this category the confusion is something discouraging. At least three, if not more, commentators can be detected. Most of the notes containing such expressions as "abundat," "abundans," "ex abundantia" and the like doubtless belong here. In certain notes, as will be seen below, *παρέλκον* was looked upon simply as an element of style. With reference to some expressions, e. g. "plerique omnes," a second commentator disputes this view. The expression, he says, is not *παρέλκον* but *ἀρχαῖσμός*. Still a third tries to reconcile the two opposing views by saying that the expression is both *παρέλκον* and *ἀρχαῖσμός*. From this last seems to be drawn the inference visible in certain notes, presumably by a fourth commentator, that *παρέλκον*, wherever it occurs and whatever its character, is, in itself, an archaism. *παρέλκον* includes everything "abundans," whether a fault or an element of conscious art, whereas the pleonasmus, perissologia and tautologia of Donatus (*Ars Gram.*), to which it partly corresponds, refer only to a faulty fullness. The scholiast finally goes so far as to take *παρέλκον* over into rhetoric and make it a regular figure of speech. (See Hahn for exx.)

This registration of opposing views is best seen in the comment on "plerique omnes" (*And. i. i. 28*). The first note is by the supporter of the *παρέλκον* theory: "Haec adiectio dicitur in primo posita loco. Adiectiones vero aut in prima parte orationis aut in ultima adiiciuntur. Hic ergo 'plerique' *ex abundantia* positum est: 'omnes' vero necessario additum est. Et alibi 'calesces plus satis' (*Eun. i. 2. 5*). In ultimo, sicut, 'interea loci,' 'interibi.'" Then the second commentator adds: "'*Ἀρχαῖσμός* est. Nam *errant* qui 'plerique' *παρέλκον* intellegunt aut qui subdistinguunt 'plerique' et sic inferunt 'omnes.' Hoc enim pro una pars orationis dixere veteres. Eodem modo Graeci πάμπολλα

et Latini 'plus satis' " (quoting Naevius). Then follows a third commentator, who evidently tries to reconcile the two opposing theories by "Figurate Terentius παρέλκον τῷ ἀρχαϊσμῷ." In Phorm. 1. 3. 20 "plerique omnes," according to Hahn, we again meet the writer of the first note to And. 1. 1. 28 in the words "παρέλκον tertium" (quoting And. 1. 1. 28), followed by his opponent: "Et est ἀρχαϊσμός ut 'plus satis' (Eun. 1. 2. 5)." As the note stands, however, I see no reason why the third commentator of And. 1. 1. 28 should not be the author of it. The first and second commentators are again met with in Eun. 1. 2. 5. No. 1, "Nove, sed intellegitur, etc." No. 2, "Nove sed intellegitur plus satis, etc."

Writers of comments like the following must have drawn the conclusion from the preceding that *all* exx. of παρέλκον were archaisms.

Phorm. 5. 8. 11) "Adhuc curavi." "τῷ ἀρχαϊσμῷ addidit 'adhuc' quum potuisset sine hoc integer sensus esse." Eun. 5. 8. 5) "Scin me," "Cum sufficeret 'scin.' Ergo 'me' abundat et est figura ἀρχαϊσμός." (Cp. Schol. to Haut. 1. 1. 116, Hermes 2. 338 ff., and for a full list of the examples in Donatus called παρέλκον cp. Hahn, 1872, p. 5 ff.)

Now let us enquire into the actual value of the comment above quoted. Is "plerique omnes" an archaism? Does it count as one word or is it an example of so-called παρέλκον?

The expression may have been, and doubtless was at all periods, common in the everyday speech. However its origin is to be explained, that it was decidedly old-fashioned in the literary language seems amply proved by the examples of its use. (Ter. Phorm. 172, Haut. 830, Plaut. Trin. 29, where see Brix.)

It is unfortunate that we have lost the passage in Gellius (8. 12) bearing especially on this question. The title, however, shows that he looked upon it as an archaism and as a single word, "Quid significet in veterum libris scriptum 'plerique omnes' et quod ea verba accepta a Graecis videntur." It would appear that the second commentator of And. 1. 1. 28 (sup. p. 5) either drew his information from Gellius or from the same source with him. The remark "Eodem modo Graeci πάμπολλα, etc." might very well correspond with something in Gellius under the head of: "quod ea verba accepta a Graecis videntur."

Gellius himself, as might be expected, uses the expression frequently (e. g. 1. 3. 2; 1. 7. 4; 4. 17. 4; 14. 3. 1; 15. 7. 1, etc., once in 10. 24. 4 "pleraque omnis," 19. 12. 1 "univorsi omnes," cp. Ap. Met. 7. 189).

In "plus satis" (Eun. 1. 2. 5; Haut. 1. 2. 24) the ellipsis of *quam* is apparent. "Interibi" occurs six times in Plautus, once in Afranius, and again comes to the surface in Apuleius. In Gellius 3. 7. 17 the preferred reading is "interim." (See Brix and Lorenz, *Miles*, 104; Lorenz, *Most. Intro.*, p. 31, note. For "plerique omnes," Spengel, *And.* 55. 2d ed.; Dziatzko, *Phorm.* 172; Brix, *Trin.* 29.) That "interea loci" is a parallel to "plerique omnes" except as an archaism is doubtful. I find it only in Plautus, Terence and Pacuvius. (Lorenz, *Pseud.* 255.)

And. 1. 3. 18) "'Is obiit mortem.' Plene dixit quod nos 'obiit' tantum. Vergilius: 'morte obita, etc.'" (*A.* 10. 641). Donatus' statement, as tested by examples, seems to be fairly correct. "Mortem obire," itself a euphemism, is old-fashioned or poetic. In later times the expression was still further softened to "obire." Examples show, however, that both "obire" and "obire mortem" were used as early as Plautus.

"Mortem obire," Plaut. *Aul.* 15; Cic. *Phil.* 5. 17. 48, etc.; cp. "diem suum obire," Plaut. *Cist.* 1. 3. 27; Sulp. ap. Cic. *Fam.* 4. 12. 2; Gell. 6. 8. 6, etc.

"Obeo" alone, with or without the manner of death, is well represented. Plaut. *Epid.* 513 (Ritschl 'abeas'); Lucret. 3. 1045; Horace, Livy, Pliny, Tacitus, etc.

And. 3. 5. 8) "'Quid—me faciam.' Ablativus casus 'me.' Sed nos, 'quid faciam,' veteres autem 'me' addebant." (So Klotz after the Venice ed. Earlier edd. than K. omit "sed nos ff.")

"Quid me faciam, etc.," is a conversational usage. The ablative is generally used, sometimes the dative, rarely the ablative with *de*.

Ablative: Plaut. *Bacch.* 334, etc.; Ter. *Haut.* 462; Cic. *Sest.* 13. 29, etc.

Dative: Cic. *Caecin.* 11. 30, etc.; Hor. *Sat.* 1. 1. 63.

Ablative with *de*: Plaut. *Epid.* 151 (Ritschl omits *de*); Ter. *Adel.* 996; Nepos, *Them.* 2. (See Spengel, *And.* 614; Lorenz, *Most.* 638 and 435; Schmalz, *Lat. Gram.*, p. 280, n. 6.)

As appears from the exx., this idiom was confined largely to Cicero and the comic writers. That it was so freely used by the latter shows that it must have been a favorite of the people, among whom it doubtless remained long after its disappearance from literature.

Eun. 3. 5. 1) "'Nemo homo est.' Quamvis per 'nemo' 'homo' intellegatur tamen addidit 'homo' ut veteres solent τῷ ἀρχαϊσμοῦ." Klotz marks this passage as spurious. Compare :

Adel. 2. 3. 6) "'Homini nemini.' Nove auribus nostris sed veterum consuetudine locutus est. Nam quum 'nemini' hominem significet quid opus fuit dicere, 'homini nemini'? Sed ut diximus figura est ἀρχαῖσμός."

That Donatus ever called ἀρχαῖσμός "figura" is more than doubtful. If, as Klotz thinks, the comment at Eun. 3. 5. 1 is spurious, it was possibly placed there by some one on account of the "ut diximus" at Adel. 2. 3. 6. The connection of the two is evident. Here it is instructive to compare Charisius (Keil 1. 96. 15), who comments on the same usage, quoting Lucilius and Eun. 3. 5. 1. One is tempted to believe that all three notes came from the same source, the source whence Charisius and Donatus drew their material.

With the foregoing compare the notes on "servum hominem" (Phorm. 2. 1. 62) and "homini adolescentulo" (And. 5. 1. 9). In each case the quotation from Sallust is identical.

Compare also the comments on "nemo quisquam" and "nihil quicquam," both favorite expressions in the familiar speech and frequent in comedy. (See Dziatzko, Phorm. 80, and on "homo" Dz. Adel. 259; Phorm. 591; Holtze, 1. 343.)

Adel. 2. 2. 16) "'Praeterea autem.' 'Ἀρχαῖσμός est figura.'" Then what is perhaps the addition of a later commentator: "Nam veteres libenter coniunctiones multiplicabant."

The point of the note seems to be the pleonastic use of "autem," the frequent employment of which, even in direct questions, is a characteristic of comedy, and of Cicero, especially in the philosophical writings, where the conversational method is so much used. Much less frequent in the historians, owing to the more sedate character of their work. (See Schmalz, pp. 306 and 403.)

Adel. 5. 9. 1) "'Suo sibi.' Non 'suo' sed 'suo sibi,' moraliter ut et veteres solent loqui." "Emphatically, and also as the ancients used to speak." In both counts the commentator is correct. This doubling of the pronoun is ante- and post-classic and colloquial. It is found in all three persons, oftenest in the third. Plautus and Terence use it, and Cicero in the epistles and earlier works. It does not appear again until the archaists of the second century.

Examples are plentiful. Plautus, Poen. 1083; Persa, 81; Capt. 81, etc.; Cicero, Phil. 2. 37. 96; Col. R. R. 12. 7. Then in late Latin: Gell. 5. 10. 16; 12. 1. 6; Apuleius, Met. 1. 104. 35; 106,

31, and often. (See Schmalz, p. 402, par. 63. 2; Dz. Adel. 958; Brix, Trin. 156; Holtze, 1. 300.)

Phorm. 1. 2. 80) "'Omnia haec.' Non ex abundanti posuit sed oratorie quasi tam multa. Et est ἀρχαῖσμός. Nam post enumerationem veteres 'hoc' dicebant. Salustius in Iugurtha (85)." The words "Non ex abundanti—multa" appear to be directed against one of the frequent remarks on παρέλκον which perhaps once stood here but has since dropped out. Hic very often refers to a notion preceding, rarely to one following. To sum up a number of particulars with "haec" or "haec omnia" is an especial characteristic of the style of Cato (R. R.); 8, 37, 73, 133, 51, 31, 33. (See Holtze 1. 369; Draeg. 1. 83.)

Phorm. 5. 4. 2) "'Parare in animo, etc.' Vetuste additum est 'animo.' Ennius in sexto: "Sed quid ego hic animo lamentor" (Baehr. 145).

It is difficult to discover anything especially old-fashioned in the expression "Parare in animo cupiditates." The quotation from Ennius does not seem an exact parallel. In "animo lamentor," "animo" might be considered as 'παρέλκον,' but here the sense does not seem rounded without it.

Judging from the examples, the use of "animo" with verbs of thinking is more or less peculiar to the elder literature. For instance: "cogitare cum animo," Ter. Adel. 500, Cato ap. Gell. 16. 1. 4; Fronto 221. 7; "considerare in animo," Ter. Haut. 385; "cogitare in animo," Ter. Adel. 30, 818; "animo cogitare—statuere apud animum," Livy 34. 2 (speech of Cato).

Phorm. 5. 8. 71) "'Adfectant viam.' Plenum quod nos ἐλλειπτικῶς." Affectare viam or iter is mostly peculiar to Plautus and Terence. (Plaut. Men. 686; Aul. 575; Ter. Haut. 301; Phorm. 964. Affectare iter, Cic. Rosc. Am. 48.) I find no examples of affectare alone used in the sense of the foregoing.

I can only explain the last part of the note by supposing that the commentator looked upon "affectare viam ad aliquid" as the original form whence all the various usages of affectare have been derived. In that case "quod nos ἐλλειπτικῶς" would be entirely correct.

(b.) παρόμοιον, παρονομασία.

(See especially Wölfflin, "Die allitterierenden Verbindungen der lat. Sprache; Sitz. Ber. d. bayr. Akad. 1881, p. 1. ff.; "Der Reim im Latein," Archiv 1. 350-389.)

The fondness of the older writers for alliteration, punning and

the like is too well known to require any detailed discussion here. What remains is to examine the several comments on the subject, to see whether they agree with each other or with Donatus.

In his *Ars Gram.* (K. 4. 398), Donatus says: "Paronomasia est velut quaedam denominatio, ut; "Nam inceptio est amentium non amantium" (And. 1. 3. 13). Evidently he looks upon paronomasia as the proximity of words that sound alike but have a different meaning, briefly, "punning." Parhomoeon, according to his definition, is simply alliteration; "cum ab isdem litteris diversa verba sumuntur, ut; "O Tite, tute Tati tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti" (Enn. Müll. 108).

Charisius (K. 1. 282. 7) holds the same view. Diomedes (K. 1. 446. 13) includes under paronomasia the "*figura etymologia*." "Paronomasia," he says, "est veluti quaedam denominatio cum praecedenti nomini aut verbum aut nomen adnectitur ex eodem figuratu, ut, 'fugam fugit,' 'facinora fecit,' etc." And then, "Et aliter fit, etc." (repeating Charisius and Donatus).

This, it may be observed, enlarges the sphere of paranomasia to an immense extent. So too (446. 30) *παρόμοιον* is extended to "verba vel nomina paululum inflexa et tamen prope similia superioribus ut" (quoting Verg. A. 4. 13).

In our commentary great confusion is visible in the use of these two words *παρόμοιον* and *παρονομασία*, partly owing to a jumbling together of the definitions of Donatus and Diomedes, and partly to a total misunderstanding of their meaning. For instance: And. 1. 3. 13) "'Nam inceptio est amentium,' etc. Amabant veteres de proximo similia dicere; ut Cicero, 'Minus carum putavit fore de armario quam quod de sacrario fuisset ablatum.'"

So far the note is correct, though it must be acknowledged that we should not be much impressed by such a pun as the one quoted. After this follows the remarkable statement of some amateur commentator: "Quaedam in *verbis* sunt quae *παρόμοια* dicuntur, in *nominibus* *παρονομασία*." Surely an entirely original distinction between the two words.

Compare And. 1. 5. 7) "'Id mutavit quoniam me immutatum,' *παρόμοιον*." To which the second commentator of And. 1. 1. 13 has again added: "Nam quotiens verba sunt *παρόμοιον* dicitur, quotiens nomina, *παρονομασία*."

A comparison of the authorities above mentioned will show that if *παρόμοιον* applies to "mutavit—me immutatum," the definition of it was taken from Diomedes rather than Donatus.

Compare: And. 4. 4. 38) "'Provolvam teque in luto ibidem pervolvam.' De proximo παρόμοιον repetivit." Again the note is added: "Et quando *nomina* sunt παρονομασία, etc." (Cp. Hec. prol. 2. 11; 1. 2. 90; 5. 1. 34; And. 5. 5. 8.)

Adel. 3. 3. 69) "'Quod queo.' A coquendo sumpsit παρόμοιον, etc. (alluding to Cicero's pun, "Tu quoque"). Here Donatus would have said παρονομασία, not παρόμοιον.

In Adel. 3. 2. 1) "Omnes omnia." We read: "ὑπερβολή cum παρονομασίᾳ 'omnes omnia.'" Certainly no paronomasia is visible. We should rather expect the παρόμοιον of Diomedes.

Compare now Adel. 3. 2. 2) "'Nihil afferant.' Mire de proximo repetitum est παρόμοιον, id est, 'conferant' et 'afferant,' and then in contradiction to Adel. 3. 2. 1: "Sic supra; 'omnes omnia.'"

On "omnes omnia" (Adel. 5. 9. 21) the commentator remarks with commendable caution: "Antiqua elegantia et figurata."

Hec. 2. 3. 1 and 3. 5. 25 not only confuse the terms as defined by Donatus but also contradict each other.

Hec. 2. 3. 1) "'Inique aequē.' Comicum παρόμοιον."

Hec. 3. 5. 25) "'Iniqua aequa,' παρόνομασται sunt Terentianae."

The example tallying best with the Donatus theory of παρόμοιον is noted at Eun. 4. 7. 10) "'Solus Sannio servat domi.' Haec figura παρόμοιον dicitur."

Possibly also And. 3. 3. 10) "'Nuptiae ut fuerant futurae fient.' . . . Hoc genus compositionis non vitabant veteres." So much for these two figures. The frequent use of them as a mark of proverbial and especially of older Latinity is without question. That Donatus so considered them is also evident. But the examples cited will show how lamentably the facts of the case were obscured by later commentators.

(c). *Ellipsis*.

Although the confusion nearly equals that of the two figures just treated, the general question of ellipsis lies more or less outside of the subject in hand.

For convenience a few exx. have been grouped under the title. (See Hahn, 1872, p. 7 ff.)

Eun. 1. 2. 53) "'Et fidibus scire.' Vetusta ἔλλειψις (i. e. of cantare). Cantare, with 'tibiis' or 'fidibus' as the ablative of instrument, is to be found, though rarely, in Plautus, Terence, Cicero, Ovid and Nepos.

With ellipsis of cantare I find only Cic. Lael. 8. 26; De Sen. 8; Fam. 9. 22. 3. (Schmalz 279. 99; Holtze, 1. 135, etc.)

Eun. 4. 4. 10) "'Nostrarum.' Ἀρχαῖσμός est figura pro nostrarum vel nostrorum, id est, quae familiae nostrae sunt, etc."

The note makes no sense as it stands. Something has fallen out, and a comparison of other notes on the same point suggests "nostrum."

Read then: "'Ἀρχαῖσμός est figura, pro *nostrum*, nostrarum, etc."

Compare Hec. 2. 1. 19) "'Vestrorum quisque.' Vestrorum pro vestrum. Sic veteres."

Hec. 2. 1. 43) "'Vestrarum nulla.' Pro vestrum," etc.

(On nostrorum for nostrum, etc., see Lorenz, Most. 280; Holtze 1. 350; Gell. 20. 6.)

Adel. 2. 4. 6) "'Ne id assentandi.' Antiqua ἔλλειψις. Deest enim 'causa.'"

This seems entirely correct.

(Dz. Adel. 270; Holtze 1. 143, where a number of such exx. from early Latin are quoted.)

The same may be said of the anacoluth in Adel. 4. 5. 14) "'Ut opinor, has non nosse.' Potuit recte dicere et hoc: 'ut opinor has non nosti,' sed illud vetustius." (Dz. Adel. 648; Phorm. 480.)

Hec. 5. 1. 4) "'Minus fecisse.' . . . an 'minus fecisse' pro poenitere? Sic enim veteres dicebant: 'muto factum' et 'nolo factum' cum alicuius rei eos poenitebat."

Compare the two notes on "instat factum" (And. 1. 1. 120).

It is very likely the commentator is right in saying that "nolo factum," etc., is archaic for "poenitere," but he says nothing of the evident archaism, the omission of *esse*, which is frequent in early Latin—especially in formal expressions with *nolle*, *velle* and *oportet*. (Dz. Adel. 13; Phorm. 165; Holtze 2. 1 f.)

Adel. 5. 4. 20) "'Illum ut vivat optant.' Σύλληψις. Nam sic veteres loquebantur. Nos vero dicimus 'illi optant,' non 'illum.'"

There is no proper syllepsis here as Donatus understood it.

The subject of the dependent clause is made the object of the leading verb. The construction is frequent in comedy.

(Cf. Eun. 5. 8. 5; Phorm. 2. 3. 8; Hec. prol. 2. 4.) (Draeger 2. 498.)

Hec. 3. 2. 24) "'Atque eis onera adiuta.' Locutio antiqua figurata." Then what seems to be a later addition: "'Et est ὑπαλλαγή pro: 'Ipsos onera portantes eis onera adiuta.''" Hypallage is not necessary to explain 'eis.' A few cases of adiuto or

adiuvo with the dative of the person occur in early Latin. Pacuv. (Don. Adel. prol. 16); Petron. Frag. Trag. 62 (Burm.); Gell. 2. 29 and on a coin of Heraclius A. D. 612 "Deus adiuta Romanis."

(d). *Figura etymologica.*

(See Landgraf, "De figuris etymologicis, etc.," Act. Sem. Erlang. 2, p. 1-69; Schmalz, p. 104, etc.)

As has already been observed, one at least of the commentators follows Diomedes in including the fig. etym. under the head of *παρόμοιον*. Four notes, however, refer more directly to it: Eun. 3. 5. 39; 4. 3. 2; Adel. 5. 4. 5, and Phorm. prol. 19.

(e). *Ὅμοιοτέλετον.*

(See Wölfflin, "Der Reim im Latein," Archiv 1. 350 ff.; Schmalz, p. 406 ff., etc.) Here, too, the comments neither agree with each other nor with the definitions in the *Ars Gram.*

For instance: Phorm. 3. 2. 37) "'Nihil ferentem, flentem,' *ὁμοιοτέλετον* usitatum veteribus," is a case which Donatus would call 'homoeoptoton,' "cum in similis casus exeunt verba diversa ut 'merentes, etc.' " "Homoeoteleuton," he continues, "est cum simili modo dictiones plurimae finiuntur." (*Ars Gram.*)

The more or less vulgar character of the figure was evidently recognized in the note to Eun. 2. 2. 5) "'Pannis annisque obsitum.' Vel parasitica vernilitate καθ' ὁμοιοτέλετον dictum, etc." (cp. note to Eun. 1. 2. 75). Plautus makes a very large use of the figure; Terence, as might be expected, is more sparing. (Donat. Phorm. 3. 3. 43; Serv. Ecl. 3. 1; G. 3. 539; A. 11. 112.)

After this time the usage does not appear to any extent in literature until the archaists of the second century.

(f). *Irony.*

Under this head two comments are to be noticed:

Adel. 2. 1. 22) "'Ex tuis virtutibus.' Sic veteres per *εἰρωνείαν* 'virtutes' pro 'flagitiis' dicebant." I can see no actual archaism here. If the use of 'virtutes' for 'flagitia' or any other form of irony is less frequent in the later writers, it is rather owing to the nature of their subjects. That the figure should have ever died out among the people is of course out of the question. It may have appeared archaic to the commentator because he saw more of it in the older authors, i. e. the orators and dramatists.

The comment on Eun. 1. 2. 9) “‘Sane quia vero.’ Nam ‘vero’ semper ironiae convenit ut Virgilius (A. 4. 93)” is evidently a short registration of something resembling the Bemb. schol. 1st hand to the same passage (Hermes 2. 355) “Vero modo per ironiam dixit. Nam maiores nostri ubi ponebant ‘vero’ semper ironiam significabant ut Vergilius (A. 4. 93).”

The connection between the two notes is evident even to the Vergil quotation, though the words “maiores nostri,” so often occurring in the scholia, are never used in Donatus. Vero is often used ironically (examples abound: Ter. And. 854, etc.), but of course it cannot be said that the old writers always use it so.

2. POSITION.

Here I include two notes on ‘enim’ and ‘nam.’

Adel. 2. 1. 14) “Enim inceptiva particula apud veteres fuit, sed et convenit perturbationi.”

This is confined to the comic writers (exx. frequent: Plaut. Pers. 236; Capt. 592; Ter. Haut. 72, etc.) (See Lorenz, Miles 429; Brix, Trin. 705.)

Hec. 1. 2. 100) “Nam hic inceptiva particula est ut Plautus (Miles 145).” When Servius (G. 4. 445), probably after Donatus, says: “Nam hodie postponitur” he refers to a usage only poetic and perhaps not ante-Augustan. (Lachm. Lucret., p. 246.)

3. CONSTRUCTION ACCORDING TO SENSE.

Eun. 4. 3. 7) “‘Absente nobis.’ Aut subdistingendum est et subaudiendum me aut ἀρχαῖσμός figura est ‘absente nobis’ pro ‘nobis absentibus.’ (Evidently a summary of conflicting views.) Then follows a passage from Pomponius, ‘praesente amicis,’ and one from Varro, ‘praesente legatis,’ and finally, perhaps the view of Donatus himself, “Cum sic dicit pro praepositione ponit ‘absente’ ac si diceret ‘coram amicis.’”

This usage is ante-classic and probably originates in a construct. ad sens. In familiar speech the words were looked upon as adverbs (Plaut. Bacch. 142. Nonius, pp. 76 and 154, quotes three other exx.) (See Holtze, 2. 196; 1. 352; Schmalz, 254 B.)

Adel. 4. 4. 25) “‘Aperite—aliquis.’ Vim pluralem habet aliquis quamvis singulariter dicatur. Non est enim ‘aliquis’ nisi de multis. Recte ergo ‘aper. al.’ et nove.” Then a second note: “Nam veteribus non placet illud ubi duae distinctiones sunt . . . ut assumatur ‘aperiat.’ Proprie enim veteres et ‘quis’ et ‘ali-

quis' et 'quisquam' non observabant quo genere aut quo numero declinarent. Est ergo figura ἀρχαϊσμός."

The question of gender will be considered later. The use of these pronouns as above noted is conversational, and is chiefly found in Plautus and Terence. Vergil once (A. 4. 625). (See Brix, Men. 674; Lor. Pseud. 1272.)

4. ATTRACTION.

Eun. 4. 3. 11) "' Eunuchum quem dedisti, etc.' Aut antiptosis est casus pro casu ut: 'urbem quam statuo vestra est' (A. 1. 573) aut 'quem' cum interrogatione pronuntiandum ut sit 'qualem.'" (Evidently a summary of conflicting views.) Another note follows, giving the correct explanation, that is, the first of the alternatives just proposed. "Quidam volunt," he says, "'quem' distinguere, quasi dicat 'qualem' sed nesciunt hac figura multum veteres usos esse, etc."

(Comp. Servius A. 1. 573, drawn perhaps from Donat. Phorm. 5. 8. 53.) Ladewig says (A. 1. 573) this construction is rare and occurs only in the poets. Compare, however, Cato in Leg. Voc. (I. frag. 2). (See Holtze 1. 387 f.; Schm. 394.)

5. OLD FORMULAE.

Phorm. 1. 2. 81) "' Quod erit mihi bonum, etc.' Sic enim veteres: 'quod faustum felixque sit' dicebant aliquid aggressuri."

Compare with Cic. Div. 1. 45. 102: "Quae maiores nostri quia valere censebant idcirco omnibus rebus agendis 'Quod bonum, faustum, felix fortunatumque esset' praefabantur." (Plaut. Trin. 41; Ter. And. 956; Cic. T. D. 1. 45. 118; Flacc. 41. 103; Ovid, Fast. 1. 63.)

Eun. 3. 3. 9) "' Dolo malo.' Quod autem addidit 'malo' aut (1) ἀρχαϊσμός est quia sic in XII tabulis a veteribus scriptum est aut (2) ἐπίθετον doli perpetuum aut (3) diastole est quia est et bonus quo a medentibus falli aegros non tamen decipi Lucretius poeta testatur (4. 11)." (Again a summary of conflicting views.)

With explanation (3) above quoted compare Paul, ex Fest. 69. 10 (M.): "Doli vocabulum nunc tantum in malis utimur, apud antiquos etiam in bonis rebus utebatur. Unde adhuc dicimus 'Sim sine dolo malo.' Nimirum quia solebat dici et bonus."

Dolos is quoted as originally having a good meaning—apparently on the authority of such passages as the one just given. I find no examples of it in that sense. The fact that it was often

used with 'malo' is no proof that it was originally used in a good meaning and therefore needed the adjective to define it. Such pleonastic expressions are common in the familiar speech of all nations.

In the elder tongue 'dolo malo' is frequent; in the conservative language of the law it existed at all times. Examples are frequent.

Far more common and classic, though rare in Cicero, owing perhaps to his legal training, is 'dolo' alone.

Donatus once uses "dolum malum" himself (Eun. 4. 5. 1), twice "sine dolo," both as explanations of "sedulo." (Adel. 2. 43; Phorm. 2. 3. 81.)

II.—OF SINGLE WORDS, ETC.

I. WORDS OBSOLETE OR RARE.

Nouns.

And. 3. 2. 10) In explaining 'puerpera,' Donatus adds: "Et apud veteres 'puer, puellus, puera, puella.'"

Comp. Suet. Cal. 8: "Quod antiqui 'puellas, pueras' dictarent."

Liv. Andron. (Prisc. 697 P.); Varro (Non. 156. 14 and 17).

Puellus: Lucil. (Non. 158. 18); Enn. (id. ib.); Varro (id. ib.); Lucret. 4. 1252; Ap. Met. 7. 197. 10, etc.

Eun. 4. 3. 13) Donatus says the ancients called heavy wine 'temetum,' "eo quod *tentaret* mentem, etc."

Gell. 10. 23. 1: "vino quod 'temetum' prisca lingua appellabatur."

Plaut. Aul. 355; Cato (Pliny 14. 13; 14. 90); once in Cic. Rep. 4. 6. 6; Hor. Ep. 2. 2. 163; Iuv. 15. 25.

Adel. 4. 2. 39) In explaining 'angiportus' the commentator says: "Nam domos vel *portus* vel *insulas* veteres dixerunt."

Comp. Fest. 233 M., "Portum in XII pro domo positum omnes fere consentiunt." Once as "warehouse" (Dig. 50. 16. 59; cp. Cassiod. Var. 1. 25).

Insula means a tenement, as opposed to domus, the home of a rich family. Cic. Off. 3. 16. 66, and so on up to the second century. In ecclesiastical Latin "insula" is used for a temple.

Pronouns.

And. 3. 3. 48) "'Eccum video.' 'Eccum' quasi ecce eum; veteres dixerunt 'eccum eccuius (?), ellum,' quod apertius significat

'ecce illum' et obscurius 'illum.'" Comparison with other comments shows that the words "ellum quod apertius—illum" are a reference to the two conflicting views on the derivation of 'ellum.' "More plainly," he says, "ellum stands for ecce illum" (en illum? Cp. And. 5. 2. 14). "The theory that ellum is a pronoun—another form of 'illum'—is more obscure."

And. 5. 2. 14) Conflicting views are again registered. "Veteres quod nos 'illum' dicimus vel 'ellum' vel 'ollum' dicebant" (the pronominal theory)—"quamvis 'ellum' quidam 'ecce illum' velint intellegi . . . dicens 'ellum' quasi 'en illum'" (the theory of Donatus, if we may trust *Ars Gram.* (K. 380. 31 and *Serv. K.* 548. 6).

In what follows, another compiler quotes both views again, finally giving his verdict in favor of Donatus. In *Andria* 3. 3. 48 Donatus is repeated. In *Adel.* 2. 3. 7 both are again registered, with an indication that the pronominal theory is preferred.

(On ecce enim, etc., see *Harvard Studies* 1. 192 ff.; *Speng. And.* 580 (2d ed.); *Dz. Adel.* 361; *Lor. Miles* 1310; *Brix, Capt.* 1005, etc.)

And. 5. 4. 29) "'Cuiam igitur.' Vetuste 'cuiam' quod omnibus generibus et casibus servit."

Cp. *Schol. Haut. prol.* 8 (*Herm.* 2. 363) and *Serv. Ecl.* 3. 1.

Cuius, -a, -um is common in Plautus and Terence. It disappears in the later writers, but must have always been in the popular speech. *Comp. Span.* 'cuyo, cuya.' (See esp. *Speng. And.* 763.)

Verbs.

And. 3. 3. 12) Don. justly says "'temno' veteres dicebant sine praepositione." "The use of the simple for the more usual compound is an element in the art of the Latin poet" (*Schn.* 382. 36).

Hec. 3. 4. 10) "'Aufugerim.' Sic veteres quod nos 'fugerim.'"

Aufugio is very rare but classic. Not used by Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Tibullus, Horace, Ovid or Sallust. Twice in Cicero's *Orations Verr.* 1. 35 and 5. 79. Once in Tacitus (*H.* 2. 8). *Propert.* 1. 9. 30; *Livy* 1. 25. 8 (story of the Trigemini).

Adverbs.

And. 2. 1. 35) "'Ne mihi detur.' Veteres frequenter 'ne' pro 'non' dicebant." Compare *And.* 4. 4. 45; *Eun.* 2. 3. 36; 3. 3. 2; 3. 1. 49; *Phorm.* 1. 3. 5.

In the time of Plautus, ne the original negative and non the

derivative were used indifferently for simple negation, as is shown by 'ne vis' and 'ne vult' beside 'non vis' and 'non vult,' 'nescio' and 'non scio.' The separated 'non velim,' etc. (Most. 681) are common along with the compounds of the same.

In Terence only the compounds are used. (Draeger 1. 133; Holtze 2. 321; Brix, Trin. 1156, etc.)

The 'utinam ne' of Phorm. 1. 3. 5 is not a 'vetus elocutio,' so far as I can discover. Utinam ne and non are equally classic. Cic. Att. 11. 9. 3 uses both forms.

In some of the preceding comments on ne for non, apropos of nimirum and quidni, Donatus also speaks of the use of ni for ne, i. e. simple negation (Eun. 3. 3. 2; 2. 3. 6; cp. 4. 4. 7, and Serv. A. 3. 686).

Ni as an absolute negative remains only in the two words Donatus mentions. (See Holtze 2. 377.)

Phorm. 1. 1. 9) "'Unciatim.' Sic veteres multa," referring probably to the adverbs in *-tim* used in great numbers by ante- and post-classic writers. (See Draeger 1. 117, par. 65.)

Eun. 1. 3. 25) "'Qui vir sies.' In veteribus invenitur." What is found in the old writers? The words must represent a much longer comment. At least three things occur in the passage quoted of which Donatus might have said "In veteribus invenitur." The prolepsis of *te* ("te ostenderes qui vir sies"), which, as was shown under the head of "attraction," Donatus considers an archaism. Or he may have taken *qui* as the old-fashioned representative of *ut*. (Compare notes to And. 3. 2. 21; 2. 1. 17; 2. 1. 34; Hec. 2. 3. 6; 3. 1. 54; 4. 1. 38; Eun. 5. 3. 2; Phorm. 1. 2. 80; 2. 3. 34; 2. 3. 49; Adel. 5. 3. 14.) Or thirdly and more likely, the note may refer to the archaic use of *quis* for *quis*. (Holtze 1. 392; Brix, Trin. 439.)

2. WORDS, THE MEANING OF WHICH HAS CHANGED, ETC.

Nouns.

And. 1. 5. 16) "'Oratio me miseram.' Etiam pauca verba veteres 'orationem dicebant.'"

This note seems to have been suggested by the passage quoted. Compare, however, Charisius (K. 1. 152. 10); Cic. T. D. 5. 16. 47.

And. 2. 5. 15) "'Verum illud verbum est.' Id est, proverbium et sententia. Et sic veteres 'verbum' pro sententia." Compare notes on Eun. 1. 2. 95; 1. 2. 98; 4. 5. 6; Adel. 5. 8. 29.

This usage, as Donatus says, belongs chiefly to the ante-classic period. Plaut. Truc. 885, 931; Aul. 547 and often; Sal. Iug. 11. 7. (Spengel, And. 240, 2d edit.)

And. 2. 6. 2) "'Gratia.' Gratia pro causa veteres ponebant."

Compare notes on Adel. 4. 2. 25 and And. 3. 4. 8.

A well-known archaism. Cp. Plaut. Bacch. 97; Pseud. 1277; Ter. Hec. 617; Eun. 99, 159; Sal. Iug. 54. 4; 80. 4. (See Holtze 2. 53; 1. 143.)

Adel. prol. 1. 1) "'Scripturam suam.' Indifferenter omnis qui aliquid scripsisset, *scriptor* a veteribus dicebatur."

He means that *scriptor* was used for comicus, epicus, historicus, etc.

Adel. 2. 1. 29) "'O hominem impurum.' Sic veteres 'impurum' generaliter pro 'improbo' ponebant ut in eadem hac fabula (3. 3. 6)."

Compare Schol. Bemb. on Adel. 2. 1. 29 (Hermes 2. 383).

Plaut. Rud. 652; Ter. Eun. 235; Haut. 629; Cic. Cat. 2. 10. 23. and often. (Dziatzko, Adel. 183.)

Adel. 4. 5. 16) "'Virgo.' Virginem autem ἀρχαῖσμός pro muliere dixit." Cp. note on Adel. 4. 7. 13, where he quotes Verg. E. 6. 47.

The usage is largely poetical. Ovid H. 6. 403; Hor. C. 2. 8. 23, etc.

Attention might be called, in passing, to a similar use of "maid" in old English, "puce" in French, etc.

Adel. 5. 8. 20) "'Age prolix.' Aut 'Age prolix,' id est, 'Age benigne,' ut sit 'prolix' benigne secundum veteres, aut etc."

The alternative proposed is that *prolix* is a noun in the vocative (so Klotz). Later editors properly take *prolix* as an adverb.

In the sense of "courteous" *prolixus* is Ciceronian. Fam. 3. 8. 8; Att. 6. 3. 5; 16. 16. 4.

Phorm. 2. 1. 57) "'Columnen.' Columnen culmen an columnen columna? Unde columellae apud veteres dicti servi maiores domus" (quoting Lucilius, Baehr. 412, and Tubero). Horatius contra, pro columine 'columnam' (C. 1. 35. 13—the only ex.), Ennius (Baehr. 232). Columnen is often used thus, but the foregoing are the only exx. I have found of columella and columna used in this tropic sense.

Phorm. 2. 1. 83) "'Amicos advocabo.' Amicos et pro testibus et pro advocatis veteres posuerunt." A similar use in Greek is well known. This note may have been suggested by the passage. Cp. Cic. Caec. 8. 22; Hor. C. 2. 18. 12; Iuv. 3. 57, etc.

Adjectives.

Adel. 4. 5. 39) "'Tam grandem.' 'Grandem' ad aetatem veteres rettulerunt non ad corpus. Et in pârte aetatis dicitur *grandis* non in tota vita nisi si addatur *natu*, ut: 'grandis natu parens adductus ad supplicium,' etc."

Cp. note on Phorm. 2. 3. 15, apparently a short summary of the preceding. To say that the ancients used *grandis* only of age, and not of size, is, of course, going too far. *Grandis* alone (of a growing person) is evidently used both of age and size. Lucret. 2. 1164; Cic. Pis. 36. 87, etc.

Eun. 1. 2. 52) "Facie honesta." Schol. Bemb. 1st hand (Hermes 2. 356) "Honestam dicit pulcrum. Nam maiores nostri 'honestum' dicebant pulcrum. Nam paulo post dicturus . . . 'inhonestum' (Eun. 2. 3. 65) id est, deformem. Cp. Schol. Bemb. 2d hand (Hermes 2. 356) on Eun. 2. 1. 24 and 3. 2. 21; also Donatus on Eun. 2. 3. 65: "'Inhonestam,' foedam, ut contra—'facie honesta' (Eun. 1. 2. 52) ut apud Verg. (A. 1. 595)."

Compare also Donatus on Eun. 2. 1. 24; 3. 2. 21; And. 1. 1. 96. The Schol. Bemb. on Eun. 1. 2. 52 is important, because it is doubtless much nearer the original words of Donatus than the short notices at Eun. 2. 1. 24; 2. 3. 65, and 3. 2. 21. *Honestus* of personal appearance is mostly poetic. Exx. are frequent.

Verbs.

Hec. prol. 35) "'Adiutans.' Sic veteres dicere maluerunt quam 'adiuvans.'" The Schol. Bemb. on same passage is almost identical.

In Adel. prol. 16 the text now stands "adiutare" (cp. Donat.).

In Phorm. 3. 3. 4, on the contrary, "adiuverit" (cp. Donat.).

In Terence the usage is about evenly balanced. Plaut. Pseud. 83 Lorenz reads "adiuvas."

Phorm. prol. 2) "'Transdere.' 'Transdere' veteres sonantius, quod nos lenius dicimus 'tradere' ut 'tralatum' nos 'translatum' e contrario."

Compare Schol. Bemb. (H. 2. 377) on the same passage.

'Transdo' is most frequent in Caesar, B. C. 1. 68; 1. 76, etc.

Tradere occurs often in Plautus, as in the later writers. (Neue 2. 734 ff.)

Eun. prol. 44) "'Animadvertite.' Nos ἁλλειπτικῶς dicimus 'advertite' quod veteres plene 'animum advertite.'" Evidently

'animadvertite' at the head of this comment should read 'animum advertite.' The context shows that Donatus so read it. The text, however, is the Terentian "animum attendite."

(Cp. Donat. And. prol. 8, where Dziatzko reads "attendite"—Spengel "advortite," after Fleckeisen and the older editors.)

The MSS. vary so much between animadverto and animum adverto that it is difficult to make trustworthy statistics. The full form is so frequent in the earlier literature that all the Terentian exx. of animadverto have been altered to animum adverto by the later editors.

Animum adverto, if we may trust the MSS., occurs more or less frequently throughout the literature, but with the acc. and infin. it is mostly ante-classic, occurring in Cic. Caes. and Sal. as an archaism.

Adverto (for animadverto) occurs perhaps once in Cicero (Fam. 1. 1); Verg. A. 4. 115—more frequently in the historians, especially Tacitus and Pliny.

Statistics for Adel. Phorm. and Hec. show that Donatus himself uses animadverto 13 times, adverto 4 times (one spurious—Klotz 2. 406. 25), and animum intendo once (Kl. 2. 390. 22).

And. 4. 4. 11) "'Miror unde sit.' 'Miror' veteres cum 'unde' pro 'nescio' ponebant." Then what seems an explanation by a later commentator: "Nam admiratio ab ignorantia descendit."

Cp. note on Eun. 2. 2. 59.

Exx. of this usage, so far as I can find them, end with Caesar. Plaut. Stich. 541; Cic. N. D. 1. 34. 95; Caes. B. G. 1. 32, etc.

And. 2. 1. 35) "'Sat habeo.' Sic antiqui pro 'sufficit' 'satis habeo' dicebant. . . ."

Frequent in everyday speech.

Plaut. Most. 654; Amph. 509, and often. (Brix, Capt. 446; Speng. And. 335.)

Adel. 1. 2. 7) "'Designavit.' . . . Hac verbum apud veteres duas res significabat; etenim prave et recte facta 'designata' dicebantur."

'Dissignata' is now read. Compare Plaut. Most. 413 and Hor. Ep. 1. 5. 16.

And. 3. 2. 28) "'Renuntio.' 'Re-' syllaba apud veteres interdum abundat ut modo 'renuntio' pro nuntio . . ."

Compare Donat. And. 5. 1. 8, "'Remittas' pro mittas." (Rare—not in Cic. or Caesar—Sall. Iug. 52. 5; Hor. C. 2. 11. 3.) Compare also Donat. Adel. 1. 2. 41, "'Resarcietur'; Re abundat."

(Rare—not in Cicero; Col. 11. 2. 38; Livy 45. 28. Sarcio is common.)

Renuntio for nuntio is mostly ante-classic. Ter. Haut. 4. 8. 18 and often; Plaut. Pseud. 420, etc.

The use of compound for simple verbs belongs to the sermo vulgaris. The practice was discontinued by the writers of the Golden Age, but again appears with the decline of literature. (Schmalz 383, par. 39.)

Adel. 1. 1. 23) “‘Eduxi e parvulo.’ Quod nos ‘educare’ dicimus ‘educere’ veteres dicebant, ut: (Verg. A. 6. 765).”

Varro’s distinction (Non. 447. 33), “Educit obstetrix, educat nutrix, etc.,” is not always strictly observed (see Krebs 395).

Adel. 4. 2. 20) “‘Usque occidit.’ ‘Occidit’ pro vehementer cecidit. Nam ‘occidere’ et ‘praeoccidere’ (some edd. ‘peroccidere’) ad caedem referebantur apud veteres.” For ‘praeoccidere’ read ‘praecidere’ (so Georges).

Occido in this, its original sense, is very rare.

Varro, R. R. 1. 31. 1; Vulg. Apoc. 13. 3.

Phorm. 1. 2. 91) “‘Nunc amitte.’ Hunc quod nos dicimus ‘dimitte’ antiqui etiam dicebant ‘amitte,’ etc.” Amitto, for the classic dimitto, to send away, is frequent in Plautus and Terence. (See lexicons for exx.)

Adverbs, etc.

At And. 4. 3. 5 Donatus says: “Veteres dicebant ‘facile’ pro ‘certo,’ ut Cicero: ‘Illius civitatis facile princeps.’”

Facile in this sense seems mostly Ciceronian; I find few exx. elsewhere.

Plaut. Epid. 504; Trin. 706; Cic. T. D. 1. 3. 81; Rosc. Am. 6. 15, and often.

Eun. 5. 8. 34) “‘Nihil est quid dicas.’ ‘Nihil’ pro ‘non,’ ut sit: ‘non est quod dicas mihi,’ id est: nihil est quod dicas, pro ut dicas mihi, ut sit ‘quod’ pro ‘ut,’ quod pro quid dicas mihi. Certum est autem veteres sic locutos esse.”

Evidently an attempted explanation of the archaism. Compare notes on Eun. 5. 2. 45; 2. 2. 42; 4. 5. 9; Adel. 2. 1. 13; Phorm. 1. 2. 90. On “Nullus pro non,” notes to Eun. 2. 1. 10; Hec. 1. 2. 4. “Nunquam pro non,” Eun. 5. 8. 62; Adel. 3. 1. 16; 4. 1. 12; Phorm. 1. 2. 71.

These usages are all conversational and belong especially to the comic dramatists. Exx. are numerous.

(See Holtze 2. 202; Brix, Men. 1012; Capt. 989.)

Of illiberaliter in the sense of "ignobly," which Don. terms an archaism (Phorm. 2. 3. 24), I find one other ex. in Terence (Adel. 664) and three in Cicero (Rep. 1. 22; Att. 16. 3. 2; 4. 2. 5).

Eun. prol. 9 in commenting on "nunc nuper" Don. says the old writers used some qualifying word with nuper to avoid ambiguity. This belongs to the common speech and is ante- and post-classic. Plaut. Truc. 397 R.; Ap. M. 9. 16, etc.

On the use of adhuc noted by Don. at And. 3. 2. 1 see Hand. Turs. 1. 156 ff.

Hec. 1. 2. 7 appears the curious note: "'Salve mecator.' Olim salutantes addebant iusiurandum ut hoc sedulo facere viderentur, 'Immo salve' Plaut. Trin. 1153."

The truth of this statement seems supported by the comedy, but for the later writers we shall have to take his word for it.

3. CHANGES IN FORM, ETC.

Nouns.

Adel. 5. 3. 55) "'Cum primo lucu.' 'Ἀρχαῖσμός. Nam 'cum primo lucu' veteres dicebant 'lucum' pro 'luce,' etc." Then a second note, evidently an inference from the first: "Veteres masculino genere dicebant lucem." Cp. Donatus, A. G. (K. 1. 402. 2).

The Schol. Bemb. (H. 2. 400) preserves the genuine reading 'luci,' but explains it as a genitive.

With lucu, however, compare such forms as noctu, diu, interdiu. (See Dziatzko, Adel. 841; Usener, Jahrbücher (1878), p. 76 ff. Bell, De Loc. usu.)

And. 2. 2. 28) "'Nihil ornati.' 'Ἀρχαῖσμός. Sic Sallustius: 'ergo senati, etc.'"

Compare note on Eun. 2. 2. 6; "Et 'ornati' ut 'senati' antiquus genetivus." The Schol. Bemb. 2d hand (H. 2. 348) on the same passage is much fuller. Its connection with Don. And. 2. 2. 28 is shown by the fact that "nihil ornati, etc.," is quoted, also the same passage from Sallust, "ergo senati, etc."

Compare with the foregoing Don. Eun. 4. 7. 45; Hec. 3. 2. 21; Phorm. 1. 3. 2; and Schol. Bemb. Adel. 5. 4. 16 (H. 2. 400).

The system of cross references and quotations especially noticeable here seems to be one indication of the manner in which the commentary of Donatus has assumed its present proportions.

At some point, perhaps And. 2. 2. 28, Don. may have treated

this antique genitive in full, giving appropriate quotations and references to various apposite passages in Terence. Succeeding commentators recorded a brief statement of this note at the passages indicated, using his quotations as illustrations. With the foregoing compare: Probus (K. 4. 213. 14); Serg. in Donat. (K. 4. 515. 30); Charis. (K. 1. 22. 18).

For Terence see Engelbrecht, "Studia Terentiana," who follows Ritschl in claiming the *i* form to be the only one in Plautus and Terence.

For Cicero see Neue 1² 353, and for the subject in general: Ritschl 4. 169; Speng. And. 365; Dz. Adel. 870; Brix, Trin. 250.

And. 3. 5. 2 Don. mentions as an old usage the forms nulli, nullae for nullius, and nullo nullae for nulli. Comp. note on Eun. 5. 6. 3; Charis. (K. 1. 111. 7; 159. 10), and Schol. Bemb. Haut. 2. 3. 30 (H. 2. 368).

For Terence see Engelbrecht. For Plautus, Ritschl 2. 692; Brix and Lor. Mil. 356, and for special treatment of all these forms Luchs in Studemund's Studien.

"Terence never uses the fem. in -ius or i. In the masculine his usage varies, inclining, however, to the older form." (Engelbrecht.)

Phorm. 4. 3. 5 D. comments on the old forms volup and facul. Cp. Diomed (K. 1. 452. 26) and Paul, ex Fest. (87 m.)

Terence uses volup only in the single phrase volup est (Ph. 610; Hec. 857), but in Plautus volup occurs thrice with other words, twelve times with est. No traces of the original volupe remain. Facul does not occur in either Ter. or Plaut. One ex. from Lucil., Pacuv., Afran. and Attius is quoted by Nonius 111. 19 ff. (See Engelbrecht, Stud. T.; Brix, Mil. 277.)

Phorm. 4. 3. 6 "Compluria" is noted as an old form. Compare Charis. (K. 1. 73. 15; 125. 3).

Gellius, 5. 21. 6, devotes a chapter to the form "compluria," citing, for the form "pluria," Cato, Val. Antias, Caelius, Nigidius and Varro.

'Hoc plure,' mentioned by Don., is a fiction of the grammarians to account for 'pluria.' The oldest quoted form of the nom. is 'plous' (3 times in S. C. de Bacch.) (Engelbr. p. 31; Neue 2. 142; Dz. Phorm. Einl. 33. 2.)

Pronouns.

And. 4. 1. 32) "'Hae nuptiae.' Legitur et 'haec nuptiae'." (so the editors), "Sic enim veteres dixerunt."

Cp. Don. Phorm. 2. 1. 60; Eun. 3. 5. 34; and 2. 2. 38: "Hisce.' Pro hi, vetuste." After these words follows a reference to Vergil (E. 3. 102), "His certe, etc.," evidently added by a later commentator (see Hagen, Jahrb. 14. 472).

Schmidt, Hermes 8. 478, shows that Ter. uses *haec* before vowels and *h*, *hae* before consonants. (Cp., however, Dz. Einl. Phorm. p. 40.)

Plautus never uses anything but *haec*. (See Brix, Trin. 877; Lor. Most. 923.) *Haec* occurs now and then in Cicero, Vergil, Livy, etc. (See also Studemund, Jahrb. 113 (1876); Engelbr. p. 33; Speng. And. 328.)

Verbs.

And. 1. 2. 17) "'Sivi.' Sivi antique . . . aliter in Adel. (104)."

Cp. Diomed. (K. 1. 374. 13), who says *sii* is the better form; *sivi*, old-fashioned. Plautus uses only *sivi* and the contracted *sivim*, etc.; *sisti* for *sivisti* (Miles 1072).

An old perfect *sini*, *sinisset* is quoted by Diomedes, but the preceding note has no reference to such a form as *sini*. Evidently the distinction drawn is between *sii* and *sivi*. (See Speng. And. 188.)

Hec. 4. 1. 57 Don. calls attention to the old passive form "*quita est*" (Cp. Diomed. K. 1. 385. 17), and at And. 2. 6. 12 to the forms *licitum*, *placitum*, *puditum*. (Cp. Diomed. K. 1. 398. 9.)

And. 411. 29: "'Altercasti,'" he says: "*Legitur et 'altercatus es.'* Non enim '*alterco*' dicimus."

Terence uses *alterco* only in this passage (cp. Pacuv. R. 210).

In the use of active verbs, afterwards deponent, Engelbr. p. 50, shows that Terence varies but slightly from the practice of the Golden Age. The case is quite different in Plautus (Brix, Mil. 172).

Adel. 1. 1. 2) "'*ierant.*' Producte *i* pronuntiando quod nos addita *v*, '*iverant*' dicimus. Tale est illud Vergilii: '*Nos abissē rati*, etc. (A. 2. 25)." "*Tale est ff.*" is evidently the addition of a later hand. The note "*Producte, etc.*," refers to such old transitional forms as '*ierant*, *fūi*,' etc., standing between the full '*iverant*, '*fūvi*,' and the regular classic *ierant* and *fūi*. The writer of "*Tale, etc.*," shows by his quotation that he understood the words preceding to refer only to the regular classic *ierant* for *iverant*.

On such transition forms see Dz. Adel. 27. They occur gen-

erally at the end of the verse or before interpunction. (Conradt, Herm. 10. 105 ff.) The same may be said of most of the old or vulgar forms used by Terence. The transition from the uncontracted to the regular contracted forms is shown by the variation in treatment. 'Audieras,' Phorm. 573; 'audierit,' Hec. 813, etc.

Adel. 3. 4. 36 Don. notices "abduce" for the classical abduc. Cp. Schol. Bemb. (H. 2. 390), and also on "traduce," Adel. 5. 7. 12 (p. 402). Charis. (K. 1. 256. 18; 349. 25).

Besides dic, duc, fac and fer, Ter. uses "face," but only at the end of the verse (Engelbr). "Duce" he uses only when compounded (Dz. Adel. 482).

Plautus always uses the full form regardless of its position in the verse. (Ritschl, 2. 545; Brix, Capt. 356; Lor. Most. 830.)

Adverbs, etc.

Adel. 2. 3. 11) "'Nil pote supra.' . . . 'pote' pro potis et mage pro magis ἀρχαῖσμι."'

Terence uses potis before forms of esse beginning with a vowel, pote before consonants, always with a verb (Engelbr. p. 26). In Plautus, on the contrary, potis occurs nearly 600 times by itself (Lor. Ps. 877; Brix, Trin. 352, etc.). For Catullus, Cicero, etc., see Neue 2. 98. Mage is frequent in Plautus but does not occur in Terence.

Lucret. 4. 81, etc., Servius, A. 10. 48 quotes an example from Cicero's Frumentaria.

Phorm. 1. 1. 2 the note states that the old writers used indifferently either here or heri, mane or mani, vespere or vesperi.

For here and heri cp. Quin. 1. 7. 22; Charis. (K. 1. 200. 11); Holtze 1. 106. Here occurs a few times in Plautus, once in Cicero (Att. 10. 13. 1), and after the Augustan Age is perhaps most frequent. Mane is the form for classic prose, but occurs also in the early writers. (Lor. Most. 534; Pseud. 375.)

4. GENDER.

Eun. 2. 3. 18 Don. says that penus was used by the old writers in every gender. Cp. Gell. 4. 1. 2; Charis. K. 174. 28 and Lor. Pseud. 587, acc. to whom penus varied at all periods both in form and gender.

* Eun. 2. 3. 82) "'Illarum quisquam.' Quisquam multis exemplis probatur etiam feminino genere veteres protulisse ita ut in numeris haec pronomina infinita sunt."

The Schol. Bemb. 1st hand, Eun. 4. 4. 11 (H. 2. 361), has a long note on *quisquam* as a feminine form. The Don. comment on the same passage seems only a brief statement of it.

All he says is: "*Antiqua locutio est.*" Compare Schol. Bemb. Adel. 3. 2. 23 (H. 2. 385). In Hec. 2. 1. 19, Don. reads "*vestrorum.*" The text is "*vestrarum.*" *Quis, quisquam, quisque, quisnam*, as feminine forms, are ante-classic. No exx. of fem. *aliquis* and *ecquis* are to be quoted.

Quis as feminine is more frequent in the old drama than *quae*. It was originally universal, but as early as Plautus *quae* was well established and soon afterwards became the only form. (See Brix, Mil. 362.)

5. SYNTAX.

Nouns.

Eun. 4. 4. 4) "*Quid vestis mutatio.*" Sic veteres" (quoting an example from Plautus and Caecilius).

Verbal substantives in *-io* having a position between the infin. and the noun were a special characteristic of conversation. The enormous use of them by Donatus himself is at once apparent. (Brix, Trin. 709; Most. 377; Lor. Most. 6.)

Hec. prol. 1. 1) "*Hecyra est huic nomen.*" Nominativo casu figuravit quom in usu sit ut dativo dicamus; quamvis praesto sint exempla quibus veteres per omnes fere casus hoc genus locutionis enuntiabant." On the variations in this construction through Latinity see Schmalz, par. 82, note.

The dative of the name is the rule in old Latin, as it was in the days of Donatus, according to his own testimony. Editors of Terence now write "*Hecyraest*," that is, the dative according to the old usage. Donatus' mistake in reading "*Hecyra est*" instead of "*Hecyraest*" is easily explained.

Hec. 1. 2. 110) "*Dies est.*" Ἀρχαίως 'dies' non 'diebus est' dixit." Compare note on Hec. 5. 3. 2. Two things are noticeable here, the solitary example of "*ἀρχαίως*" for the usual "*ἀρχαῖοςμός*," etc., and the reference to a usage largely post-classical.

The ablative of time instead of the accusative is common in the familiar speech. Isolated examples of it occur as early as Cicero, Caesar and Sallust; oftener in Livy and Tacitus. In the Spanish inscriptions and the ecclesiastical writers the ablative is universal. (See Donat. Hec. 3. 4. 47; Serv. A. 1. 47; Schmalz 54, n. 2.)

Verbs.

Adel. 4. 2. 11) "'Etiam taces.' Antique pro 'tace.'" Sic in Andria 5. 2. 8 (cf. Donat. ad loc.)

Phorm. 3. 3. 9 shows the remains of a note probably on the same point. A well-known usage. (See Lor. Most. 383; Holtze 2. 342 f.)

Of "cave sis," Eun. 4. 7. 29, Don. says: "Quia imperativa verba sunt velut contumeliosa, addebant veteres 'sis' quod significat 'si vis.'" Exx. are frequent in conversation. See the lexicons. (Holtze 2. 371 ff.)

And. 4. 4. 36) "'Tu sis sciens.' Eloquenter. Sic enim veteres pro 'scias' dixere."

The pres. part. with esse is rare. Most frequent in the comic writers. (Holtze 2. 5; Draeger 1. 293.)

At Eun. 2. 2. 1 Don. points out the archaism in the personal use of "interest" (cp. note on Adel. 1. 1. 51). (Holtze 1. 21; Lor. Most. 407.)

At Adel. 5. 8. 5 he states the rule for the use of "deceat" in old Latin, that is, for Plautus, Terence and the archaistic writers, Salust, Gellius and Apuleius. (Serv. A. 5. 350; Dz. Adel. 491.)

Adel. 2. 3. 1, he justly looks upon the personal const. with opus est, nom. of thing needed, as a characteristic of the older writers. (See lexicons for examples.)

Three or four comments occur on the old construction of utor, fungor, etc., with the accusative. Fungor (Phorm. 2. 1. 52).

In older Latin and in Terence only with the accusative. (Schmalz 280, n. 2; Brix, Trin. 1; Dz. Phorm. 281; Langen, Archiv 3. 329 ff.) Utor (Schol. Bemb. Adel. 5. 3. 29; H. 2. 399).

Terence's usage varies between accusative and ablative. In Plautus the accusative is more frequent. (Holtze 1. 270, 276, 285.) Potior (Adel. 5. 4. 17).

Compare Serv. A. 3. 278.

Potior with the accusative does not occur in Cicero. Examples show that the construction comes from the "sermo vulgaris."

For "cum illo nupta" instead of the classic "illi nupta" noted at Hec. 4. 1. 19 and 4. 4. 34, see Holtze 1. 96.

Examples are confined, so far as I can discover, to Plautus and Terence.

Phorm. 1. 3. 2) "'Ubi in mentem eius adventi venit.'"

Nota 'venire in mentem' veteres non recordationis causa tantum sed etiam recogitationis considerationisque posuisse." Then

a second note: "Sic veteres genetivo casu proferebant; 'in mentem adveniat,' Cicero" (Verres 1. 71. 51).

The first note seems a mere suggestion from the passage. The second draws attention to a usage that is mostly Ciceronian.

Plaut. Rud. 685; Cic. Quin. 2. 6; De Orat. 2. 249, and often.

On "excruciat animi," Phorm. 1. 4. 10, Don. says: "Genetivo casu veteres figurabant hanc locutionem." (Cp. notes on Adel. 4. 4. 1; Eun. 2. 2. 43; Serv. A. 1. 14; 1. 96.)

Owing to the use of animis in the plural (Cic. T. D. 1. 40. 96), Draeger (1. 481. 5) thinks "animi" in these expressions was originally an ablative form. See, however, Bell, "De Locativi in prisca Latinitate vi et usu," p. 58 ff. Cicero does not use animi with adjectives—sometimes with the verbs *angi* and *pendere*, but more frequently the ablative. Caesar uses neither. Livy, and especially Tacitus, carry the usage further. (Holtze 1. 331; Schmalz, p. 269.)

Eun. prol. 17 and Phorm. 5. 8. 54, the old use of *dono* with the ablative and *condono* with the accusative.

This category belongs to the free use of the accusative in early Latin (Draeg. 1. 358). With *dono* the abl. of the thing is the reigning construction. With two accusatives Hec. 849. *Con dono* with two accusatives occurs rarely in Plautus, Terence and Afranius (Dz. Phorm. 947; Holtze 1. 286).

Adel. 4. 5. 32) "'Qui illa (Dz. 666) consuevit.' Legitur et 'illam' et dicebant veteres: 'hanc rem consuevit.'" *Consuesco* as an active verb is ante-classic and post-Augustan. (Lucret. 6. 397; Col. 6. 2. 9, etc.)

On the old construction of *indulgeo* with the accusative noted at Eun. 2. 1. 16 see Holtze 1. 284 and cp. Diomed. K. 1. 320. 1.

At Eun. 2. 2. 31, "Magis 'de illo' et 'de me'" he says, "veteres dicebant quam ut nos dicimus 'a me' aut 'ab illo.'"

De for ab seems to have been a mark of the familiar speech and finally took entire possession of the field in the Romance languages. (Schmalz, par. 137; Draeg. 1. 625 ff.; Holtze 1. 56 ff.)

"Quid sibi—velit," which Don. terms an archaism (Eun. prol. 45), is a conversational usage, rare after Augustus but to be met with in all periods. (See lex. for *exx.*)

The well-known comic usage of the future perf. for the future is noticed at Adel. 1. 2. 47.

This subject is fully treated by Thomas, "Syntax du futur passé de Ter.," p. 19 ff.

(See also Speng. And. 381; Brix, Capt. 293; Lor. Most. 687; Dz. Adel. 127; Schmalz 256. 8.)

Potential *velim* for *volo* noted at Adel. 4. 5. 47 as "antique" occurs often in Cicero and more or less frequently throughout the literature. Especially common in the comic writers. (Draeg. 1. 306; Holtze 2. 138.)

Adverbs, etc.

And. 3. 2. 46 "‘Multo’ etiam comparativis antiqui adiunxerunt." Cp. note Phorm. prol. 11 and Charis. K. 1. 206. 4.

Once in Ter. (Hec. 738). Often in the post-classic writers. (Schmalz, p. 373. 11.)

Olim cum dabam (And. 3. 3. 13). "Nos dicimus ‘cum darem.’"

Here olim has its original meaning of a demonstrative adverb, giving a more exact time to the following cum. Rare in later literature.

In old Latin cum with the indic. is the rule. In later Latin the imperf. subj. is used, but not regularly. Terence gives four examples of imperf. indic.: And. 96; 545; Eun. 310; Hec. 422.

(See especially Luebbert, Gram. Stud. pp. 69 and 72; Brix, Trin. 523; Speng. And. 545.)

Ne with the imperative instead of the subjunctive is noted at And. 3. 3. 11. Cp. note And. 5. 2. 27; especially Serv. A. 6. 544.

The construction belongs to the people and is not used by the classic writers. The poets give only two exx., both from Ovid: H. 17. 164; A. A. 3. 129. (Schmalz 259. 37.)

The elliptical use of fortasse with an infinitive, noted at Hec. 3. 1. 33, belongs to Plautus and Terence. (Holtze 1. 265 and 268.)

With the note on postquam with the present indic. (Phorm. prol. 1) compare Schol. Bemb. (H. 2. 376).

The usage is not infrequent in the comic writers. Afterwards very rare. (See Weiss, Livy 22. 1. 1; Krebs 889; Draeg. 2. 584.)

III.—GENERAL REMARKS.

1. *Derivation.*

Here Donatus, like most other Latin grammarians, is often absurd and fanciful. The following may serve as examples of some of the derivations he quotes from "the ancients":

And. 3. 2. 41, Tandem from tamen + idem. The note is somewhat obscure. Adel. 2. 1. 28, Lora from laura. Adel. 3. 3.

5, Ganeum “ἀπὸ τᾶς γᾶς quod ipsa sit in terra, etc.” Phorm. 1. 2. 57, Forma is connected with fervor, fornax, forceps. (See Teuber, Prg. Eberswald, 1881, p. 11.)

On “meridie” Adel. 5. 3. 62, he does better: “‘meridiem’ dixerunt veteres quasi ‘medidiem,’ r pro d posito propter cognationem horum inter se litterarum.” (Varro, L. L. 6. 4; Cic. Orat. 158; Quin. 1. 6. 30; Prisc. 551 P.)

Stowasser, Archiv 1. 273, says that from medidies we should get medies rather than meridies. The original form is better: meri die “Am hellen Tage.” (Stolz, Lat. Gram. 174. 5; Usener, Jahrb. 117. 74.)

See, however, Hintner on meridies, Separat-Abdr. aus d. Jahres-Ber. über das K. K. akad. Gym. in Wien, 1885-6; M. Warren, Am. J. Ph. 7. 228 ff.

2. Orthography, etc.

Eun. prol. 10 Don. says: “‘Thesaurum.’ Latini veteres secundum Graecos sine *n* littera proferebant.”

A consideration of the original Greek word was doubtless a cause of this statement. To be reversed. “The spontaneous growth of the nasal *n* before *s* is shown in words like thensaurus, etc. Its omission belongs to low or very late Latin. In the early languages its omission is customary in a few words, and sometimes in inscriptions.” Stolz 153. 17.

Hec. 2. 14, Don. says of “remmotum” that among the ancients doubling was the rule in liquid verbs. Cp. note Phorm. prol. 22 “rellatum.”

Not so much doubling as assimilation of the original *d* in red. (Lachm. Lucret. p. 203; Dz. Phorm. 21.)

On old *q* for *c* (“coquus”) Don. Adel. 3. 3. 69, see Stolz 171. 48. On *u* for *y* (“sura”) Don. Hec. 1. 2. 7, see Stolz 138 and Cic. Orat. 48. 160.

So much for the archaisms of Terence mentioned by Donatus. As was intended, only those notes have been considered which expressly mention some ancient usage as such. Doubtless their number would be considerably increased if we had the original commentary of Donatus.

With his keen and generally correct feeling for an archaism, it is hardly to be supposed that forms like *siem*, *faxim*, *infins* in *ier* and the like were passed over without any remark as to their character.

Hence I should judge that such notes as give a translation of these forms are brief registrations of comments once more satisfactory: e. g. And. 4. 4. 21; Eun. 1. 2. 84; Adel. 1. 2. 36; And. 5. 1. 13, etc.

It is vain to hope that we shall ever recover the original commentary of Donatus. But I cannot agree with Hahn in thinking that it has almost entirely disappeared.

From the very beginning its integrity has been interfered with, because it was always considered, and perhaps justly, merely a practical aid to the interpretation of Terence, not a literary monument to be preserved in its entirety. Compression and consequent confusion are the most serious evils that have overtaken it.

One may well say of the Donatus commentary what Martial says of his epigrams: "Sunt bona, sunt quaedam mediocria, sunt mala plura."

Certainly most of the remarks on archaisms (except Adel. prol. 1. 1; 2. 1. 22; Eun. 1. 2. 9; Phorm. 1. 3. 5; 5. 1. 16; Hec. 1. 2. 7; And. 1. 1. 79; 1. 5. 16) are "bona," and, whoever their author or authors may be, bear the light of modern work in the same lines, and prove a not inconsiderable help in the study and appreciation of the elder literature.

LIFE.

I was born in Pawlet, in the State of Vermont, on the 6th of December, 1862. I entered the public schools at Rutland, in the same State, at the age of nine, where I passed through the usual course of study necessary as a preparation for college. In the autumn of 1880 I entered the University of Vermont, at Burlington, and was graduated from there as a Bachelor of Arts in 1884. My instructor in Latin was Prof. John E. Goodrich, for whose wise counsel and unvarying interest in my welfare I shall always be grateful.

In October, 1885, I came to the Johns Hopkins University, at Baltimore, Maryland, where I have remained since that time engaged in the study of Latin, Greek and Sanskrit. My hearty thanks are due to Professors Gildersleeve, Warren and Bloomfield for the advice, encouragement, and, above all, the inspiration they have so freely given me.

KIRBY SMITH.

BALTIMORE, *April*, 1889.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 003 052 110 9

